

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

**Washington County School District
February 27-28, 2014**

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**



This publication is produced through the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS), Division of Public Schools, Florida Department of Education, and is available online at <http://www.fldoe.org/ease/mon-home.asp>. For information on available resources, contact the BEESS Resource and Information Center (BRIC).

BRIC website: <http://www.fldoe.org/ease/clerhome.asp>

Email: BRIC@fldoe.org

Telephone: 850-245-0475

Fax: 850-245-0987





Gary Chartrand, *Chair*
John R. Padget, *Vice Chair*
Members
Ada G. Armas, M.D.
John A. Colon
Marva Johnson
Rebecca Fishman Lipsey
Andy Tuck

December 8, 2014

Mr. Joseph Taylor, Superintendent
652 Third Street
Chipley, Florida 32428-1442

Dear Superintendent Taylor:

We are pleased to provide you with the **2013-14 Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Monitoring and Assistance On-Site Visit Report for Washington County School District**. This report was developed by integrating multiple sources of information related to an on-site monitoring visit to your school district on February 27 - 28, 2014. Those information sources included interviews with district and school staff, student-focus groups, student record reviews, **Local Educational Agency Profiles, Guiding Questions – District Level Needs Assessment** and an action-planning and problem-solving process. This report will be posted on the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services' (BEES) website and may be accessed at <http://www.fldoe.org/ease/mon-home.asp>.

The 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process focused on those State Performance Plan indicators that contributed to the targeting of school districts for coordinated early intervening services and those indicators that affect equity and access in the educational environment for students with disabilities. Additionally, the process focused on a shift from ESE compliance to outcomes to prepare all students for college and career readiness, which include: increasing standard diploma graduates; decreasing the number of students dropping out of school; increasing regular class placement; decreasing the need for seclusion and restraint; and eliminating disproportionality in eligibility identification and discipline.

The Washington County School District was selected for an on-site visit due to equity and access issues related to the percentages of students placed in the least restrictive environments and the rates of suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities. The on-site visit was conducted by a state support team (SST) that included BEES and discretionary project staff.

Monica Verra-Tirado, Ed.D., Chief
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Superintendent Taylor
December 8, 2014
Page Two

Ms. Elizabeth Arnold, director of ESE and student services, and her staff were very helpful to the SST in preparing for the on-site visit and throughout the visit. In addition, the principals and other staff members at the schools visited welcomed the SST and demonstrated a commitment to the education of students in the school district.

As part of the SST's visit, representatives from the school district's ESE department, the schools visited and other school district staff participated in an action-planning and problem-solving process. This group reviewed the school district's data collected prior to and during the on-site visit, and came to consensus on a priority goal related to discipline. An action plan, developed around that goal, is being implemented by the ESE department with the assistance of designated discretionary project staff from the SST.

Thank you for your commitment to improving services to exceptional education students in the Washington County School District. If there are any questions regarding this report, please contact me at 850-245-0475 or via email at monica.verra-tirado@fldoe.org.

Sincerely,

Monica Verra-Tirado, Ed.D., Chief
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

Enclosure

cc: Elizabeth Arnold
Cathy Bishop
Patricia Howell
Misty Bradley

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

Washington County School District

February 27-28, 2014

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

Washington County School District

February 27-28, 2014

Table of Contents

2013-14 Exceptional Student Education	1
Monitoring and Assistance	1
On-Site Visit Report.....	1
Authority	1
ESE Monitoring and Assistance Process	2
Background Information	2
School Selection.....	3
On-Site Activities	3
SST – On-Site Visit Team.....	3
Data Collection.....	4
Review of Records.....	4
Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment	4
Results.....	4
Discipline (Suspensions and Expulsions)	4
Least Restrictive Environment	6
Student Focus Groups	7
Commendations.....	7
ESE Monitoring and Compliance	8
Records Review.....	8
Action-Planning and Problem-Solving Process and Next Steps	8
Technical Assistance.....	10
State Support Team for Washington County School District	11
Appendix A: Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment	14
Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	16

**2013-14 Exceptional Student Education
Monitoring and Assistance
On-Site Visit Report**

Washington County School District

February 27-28, 2014

Authority

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE), Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS), in carrying out its roles of leadership, resource allocation, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation, is required to oversee the performance of district school boards in the enforcement of all exceptional student education (ESE) laws and rules (sections 1001.03(3), 1003.571 and 1008.32, Florida Statutes [F.S.]). One purpose of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is to assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities (s. 300.1(d) of Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations [CFR]). The bureau is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of IDEA and the educational requirements of the state are implemented (34 CFR §300.149(a)(1) and (2)).

In fulfilling this requirement, the bureau monitors ESE programs provided by district school boards in accordance with ss. 1001.42, 1003.57 and 1003.573, F.S. Through these monitoring activities, the bureau examines records and ESE services, evaluates procedures, provides information and assistance to school districts and otherwise assists school districts in operating effectively and efficiently. The monitoring system is designed to facilitate improved educational outcomes for students while ensuring compliance with applicable federal laws and regulations and state statutes and rules.

Under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), if a state identifies significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity in a local educational agency (LEA) with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities, the identification of children in specific disability categories, the placement of children with disabilities in particular educational settings or the taking of disciplinary actions, the LEA must use the maximum amount (15 percent) of funds allowable for comprehensive coordinated early intervening services (CEIS) for children in the LEA, particularly, but not exclusively, for children in those groups that were significantly over identified.

Section 1003.573, F.S., Use of restraint and seclusion on students with disabilities, was created in July 2010, and established documentation, reporting and monitoring requirements for districts regarding the use of restraint and seclusion for students with disabilities. School districts were required to have policies and procedures that govern parent notification, incident reporting, data collection and monitoring of the use of restraint or seclusion for students with disabilities in place no later than January 31, 2011. In July 2011, s. 1003.573, F.S., was amended to require that the FDOE establish standards for documenting, reporting and monitoring the use of manual or physical restraint and occurrences of seclusion. In September and October 2011, the standards established by the FDOE were provided to school districts and were included in the district's **Exceptional Student Education Policies and Procedures (SP&P)** document.

ESE Monitoring and Assistance Process

Background Information

The 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process focused on those State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators that contributed to the targeting of school districts for CEIS and the following indicators that affect equity and access in the educational environment for students with disabilities:

- Indicator 1 – Graduation: Percentage of youth with individual educational plans (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
- Indicator 2 – Dropout: Percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
- Indicator 4 – Rates of suspension and expulsion:
 - A. Percentage of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.
 - B. Percentage of districts that have (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support and procedural safeguards.
- Indicator 5 – Educational environments:
Percentage of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21:
 - A. Inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day;
 - B. Inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day; and
 - C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.
- Indicator 10 – Disproportionality, specific disability categories: Percentage of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
- CEIS – Services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment.
- Restraint – Rate of incidents of restraint, as reported in the FDOE website.
- Seclusion – Rate of incidents of seclusion, as reported in the FDOE website.

The 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process included four phases:

- Phase 1 was composed of planning activities that occur in advance of the first on-site visit to the school district.
- Phase 2 was the initial on-site visit to the selected school district by the state support team (SST).
- Phase 3 includes follow-up and post-initial visit activities to be conducted by a designated follow-up team, as determined by the SST and identification of the ongoing data to be collected.
- Phase 4 includes evaluation of the effectiveness of the school district's action plan, and should include participation of the comprehensive team that was involved in Phase 1.

For ESE compliance monitoring purposes, the bureau required all school districts to participate in the 2013-14 Level I Fall Cycle Self-Assessment process, which included the review of records for implementation of IEPs and a review of incidents of restraint and seclusion. School districts

identified as part of the monitoring and assistance process with on-site visits during the 2013-14 school year were exempt from self-assessing school records for IEP implementation and restraint and seclusion. Instead, bureau members of the school district's SST reviewed a sample of records as part of the on-site visit.

In a letter dated August 27, 2013, the superintendent of the Washington County School District was informed that the bureau would be conducting an on-site monitoring visit for the following focus areas: discipline and least restrictive environment (LRE) for students with disabilities.

School Selection

Upon review of the school district's data for SPP indicator 4A and LRE for students with disabilities, it was determined that the monitoring and assistance process would involve the following schools and programs for record reviews, school-level administrator interviews or on-site visits:

- Chipley High School
- Roulhac Middle School
- Vernon Middle School

On-Site Activities

SST – On-Site Visit Team

The following SST members conducted the monitoring and assistance on-site visit:

FDOE, BEESS

- Patricia Howell, program director (bureau co-facilitator)
- Karin Freeman, program specialist

FDOE, Bureau Discretionary Projects

- Kathy Christiansen, associate in technical assistance, Florida's Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Project (action-planning and problem-solving facilitator)
- Crystal Grey-Hewett, consultant, Center for Autism and Related Disabilities (CARD), Florida State University (FSU)
- Beth Hardcastle, regional coordinator, Florida Problem Solving Response to Intervention (PS/Rtl) Project
- Dr. Shelby Robertson, learning and development facilitator, Mathematics and Science, PS/Rtl Project, University of South Florida (USF)
- Pamela Sudduth, learning and development facilitator for literacy, PS/Rtl Project, USF
- Faye Yongue, program coordinator, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS), Panhandle Area Educational Consortium (PAEC)
- M.J. Ziemba, regional facilitator, Florida Inclusion Network (FIN) West Region
- Catherine Raulerson, regional coordinator, Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Rusty Holmes, consultant, FDLRS, PAEC and SEDNET
- Tury Lewis, regional transition representative, Project 10: Transition Education Network

Data Collection

On-site monitoring and assistance activities included the following:

- School-level administrator interviews – seven participants
- Student focus groups and interviews – 12 participants
- School walk-through observations – one school (observations throughout the school, across content areas and grade levels)
- Completion of IEP Implementation protocol – four students
- Action-planning and problem-solving process – 17 participants
- Review of data from the school district's LEA Profiles, Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment and data compiled from district data systems

Review of Records

The school district was asked to provide the following documents, as applicable, for each of the four students selected for review of IEP implementation:

- IEPs for the 2012-13 and the 2013-14 school years
- Current functional behavioral assessments
- Discipline and attendance records for 2013-14 school year
- Progress reports and report cards for the 2012-13 and the 2013-14 school years
- Students' current schedules
- Verification of the provision of related services and accommodations (lesson plans, teacher schedules and therapy logs)

Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment

Prior to the on-site visit, the school district was provided with questions to use as a guide in the collection of data. SST and district staff reviewed these data during the action-planning and problem-solving process. Washington County School District's questions were related to discipline and LRE for students with disabilities. A list of these questions is located in Appendix A of this report.

Results

The following results reflect the data collected and reviewed through the activities of the 2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance process for Washington County School District. Also included are commendations, findings of noncompliance and next steps, as applicable.

Discipline (Suspensions and Expulsions)

Discipline rates for students with disabilities and nondisabled students are calculated by dividing the number of students who received out-of-school suspensions (OSS) or expulsions totaling more than 10 days by total-year enrollment as reported at the end of the school year. The risk ratio is calculated by dividing the discipline rate of students with disabilities by the discipline rate of nondisabled students. A risk ratio of 1.0 indicates that students with disabilities and nondisabled students are equally likely to be suspended or expelled.

Data Review

Discipline Risk Ratio (4A)

Discipline Risk Ratios				
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Washington	1.90	.096	3.62	1.99
State	1.44	1.43	1.34	1.21

Source - LEA Profile 2014- FDOE (<http://www.fl DOE.org/ese/datapage.asp>)

In addition to the data above, the school district reported the following information during the review of the guiding questions and the action-planning and problem-solving process regarding SPP Indicator 4A:

- Discipline risk ratios were reviewed across four years (2009-13).
- The risk ratio data trends indicated positive gains during the 2010-11 school year.
- During the 2011-12 school year, the district indicated that it was in the process of changing data systems (GENESIS to FOCUS), resulting in data entry errors due to ongoing training.
- The gap between district performance and state-level targets ranged from -0.47 (2010-11) to 0.78 (2012-13), with the exception of 2011-12 (2.28).
- The discipline risk ratios for the 2010-11 and 2012-13 school years were below 3.0.
- A significant discrepancy is defined as a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher.

The school district reported the following information during the review of the guiding questions and the action-planning and problem-solving process regarding students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for more than 10 days:

- The district reported fewer suspensions during the 2013-14 school year due to administrative changes at each school as well as data entry training.
- In addition, support facilitation was being implemented at each middle school and had contributed to a decrease in discipline issues among ESE students.

In regard to the strategies and resources that had been identified by the school district, specifically related to the suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities, the school district's responses to the guiding questions included the following:

- Many teachers had attended the Kagan Professional Workshop, for research-based instructional strategies. Classroom management seems to have improved.
- School principals and Kagan trainers were conducting walk-through observations to monitor effective instructional practices in the classroom.
- School climate improvement was due to some changes on the administrative level.
- IEP teams were meeting more regularly to determine the best options for students' specific needs.

The district's SP&P included the following information regarding how it provides information and training related to positive behavioral interventions and supports:

- Administrators and school staff are provided professional development opportunities regarding positive behavioral interventions throughout the year.
- Professional development opportunities in the area of behavior interventions include: webinars, trainings provided by compact disc and Panhandle Area Education Consortium trainings.

The district's SP&P included the following information regarding the district's procedures for a student who is suspended:

- Staffing specialists are informed of each ESE student's suspension.
- A report of the ESE students' suspensions is shared with the ESE director monthly. This data is reviewed with staffing specialists and the principals.
- When a student with a disability reaches eight days of out-of-school suspension, an IEP team meeting is scheduled.
- The student's behaviors are discussed at the IEP team meeting and a manifestation determination review is conducted.
- The IEP team members determine any needed changes in placement or interventions for the student.
- School principals exercise the authority within the prescribed parameters described below on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the suspensions constitute a change of placement after more than 10 school days in a school year. Those parameters include:
 - If the student's behavior is substantially similar to the student's behavior in previous incidents that resulted in the series of removals.
 - Additional factors, such as the length of each removal, the total amount of time the student has been removed, and the proximity of the removals to one another.

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

To the maximum extent appropriate, students with disabilities are to be educated with students who are nondisabled. Regular class placement is defined as a student's participation inside the regular classroom 80 percent or more of the day. Resource room placement is defined as participation in the regular class 40 through 79 percent of the day. Separate class placement is defined as participation in the regular class less than 40 percent of the day.

The district's LEA Profile for the 2012-13 school year rate for regular, resource and separate placement do not meet the state rate. However, during the 2013-14 school year, regular and resource rates significantly improved.

Regular Class	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Washington	59%	62%	73%
Enrollment Group	72%	72%	72%
State	69%	71%	71%

Resource Room	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Washington	20%	22%	8%
Enrollment Group	7%	7%	6%
State	12%	11%	10%

Separate Class	2011-11	2012-13	2013-14
Washington	21%	17%	19%
Enrollment Group	15%	15%	16%
State	15%	14%	15%

Source: 2014 LEA Profile - FDOE <http://www.fldoe.org/ese/datapage.asp>

In addition to the data above, the school district reported the following during interviews, review of the guiding questions and the action-planning and problem-solving process specifically regarding LRE:

- The district reported that their elementary schools were still using the resource room model.
- The middle schools began using the inclusion model during the 2013-14 school year.
- Support facilitation was being used for many of the academic areas.
- Teachers participated in co-teacher training annually.
- School administrators were strategically creating a master schedule to maximize the benefit of support facilitation.

Student Focus Groups

Three student focus groups were conducted at the high school:

- One for students in general education only
- One for ESE students pursuing a standard diploma
- One for ESE students pursuing a special diploma

Students were asked questions regarding the following topics: IEP team meetings and parental participation, career and technical education, academics, extracurricular activities, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test ® (FCAT) 2.0, diploma options, dropout and suspension and expulsion.

The following information was provided by the students in the focus groups:

- Seven of the eight students with IEPs had participated in the IEP team process.
- All of the ESE students who were working toward a standard diploma and three of the four general education students only communicated clear post-high school goals that included attending college or technical school.
- Two of the three students who were working toward a special diploma had post-high school goals that did not include any postsecondary education, and the other student in this focus group did not state any plans for after high school.
- At least one student in each of the focus groups indicated that students who take special education classes are treated differently, either in discipline (“special kids don’t get in trouble”) or otherwise (“not noticed...if slower, you are knocked down”).
- Students who were working toward a special diploma stated that they were not in any clubs or sports teams, although several of the students had tried out for a few of these activities.
- Students in all of the focus groups stated that work couldn’t be made up for OSS (all Fs or Os).

Commendations

1. The district’s Federal Uniform High School Graduation Rate for 2012-13 for students with disabilities was higher than the state rate and the rate of the district’s enrollment group.
2. The district’s postschool outcome data for students with disabilities who are enrolled in higher education or competitively employed for the 2011-12 school year was higher than the state rate and the rate of the district’s enrollment group.
3. The district’s regular class placement rate for students with disabilities for the 2013-14 school year was higher than the state rate and the rate of the district’s enrollment group.

4. The district's discipline data indicates an overall reduction in the risk ratio for students with disabilities regarding suspensions for the 2012-13 school year as the risk ratio fell below 2.0.

ESE Monitoring and Compliance

Records Review

BEES staff reviewed records of four students in the school district using the IEP implementation protocol and noting disciplinary actions. No findings of noncompliance were noted in these records.

Action-Planning and Problem-Solving Process and Next Steps

As part of the monitoring and assistance on-site visit, the SST members, ESE director and representatives from the Washington County School District participated in an action-planning and problem-solving process. An action plan was developed to address the first priority selected, which was related to SPP indicator 4A, suspension and expulsion.

The school district's action plan included the following:

SPP Indicator 4(A) Action Plan

Who	Washington County District-level team – ESE and Student Services Director and District-Level Staff Specialists
What	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to monitor suspension and expulsion data via FOCUS. 2. Continue to monitor support facilitation at the middle schools, which has contributed to a decrease in ESE students engaging in problem behavior. 3. Support school administrators and the two Kagan trained coaches to ensure supports are provided to teachers and walk-throughs are completed to monitor that effective instructional practices are being implemented. 4. School administrators send all suspension letters to the ESE director for monitoring by the ESE director or staffing specialists.

SPP Indicator 5 Action Plan

During the on-site visit, the district stated plans to complete the Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) process related to SPP Indicator 5, LRE on June 2, 2014. The BPIE was completed on June 2, 2014, with plans for additional actions to be taken regarding LRE in response to the BPIE findings.

Next Steps	
Discipline	
Summary:	The district's risk ratio for SPP indicator 4A during the 2011-12 school year was 3.62. During the 2012-13 school year, the risk ratio decreased to 1.99.
Recommendation:	The district should continue to follow their current plan to support the strategies they have identified to be effective in decreasing suspension and expulsion rates.
Required Action:	None
Educational Environment	
Summary:	<p>During the 2012-13 school year, the district's rate for regular class placement was 62 percent as compared to the state rate of 71 percent. The district's separate class placement was 17 percent as compared to the state rate of 14 percent.</p> <p>During the 2013-14 school year, the regular class placement rate was 73 percent which was higher than the state rate of 71 percent.</p>
Recommendation:	The district completed the BPIE process with FIN on June 2, 2014. The district should continue to follow the BPIE service plan and communicate with FIN as needed to ensure that students are served in their LRE.
Required Action:	None
Phases 3 and 4 of the ESE Monitoring and Assistance process	
Summary	<p>Additional action planning and problem solving for other priorities for the school district in regard to least restrictive environment and discipline will be scheduled by the SST liaison for the school district and the ESE director.</p> <p>By March 30, 2015, the SST team, ESE director and designated district staff will evaluate the effectiveness of the school district's action plan(s) and determine additional next steps, as appropriate.</p>

Technical Assistance

1. **Implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Support for Behavior: Recommended Practices for School and District Leaders** (Florida's PBS Project) may be accessed at http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/pdfs/RTIB%20Guide%20101811_final.pdf and provides an overview of the critical components of an MTSS for behavior. These critical components describe systems changes that are necessary for a results-driven ESE system.
2. The district's **ESE Policies and Procedures** document provides district- and school-based standards for documenting, reporting and monitoring the use of manual, physical or mechanical restraint and seclusion developed by the FDOE. The school district's document for the 2013-14 through 2015-16 school years may be accessed at <http://beess.fcim.org/sppDistrictDocSearch.aspx>.
3. The technical assistance paper entitled **Guidelines for the Use, Documentation, Reporting, and Monitoring of Restraint and Seclusion with Students with Disabilities**, dated October 14, 2011, may be accessed at <http://info.fldoe.org/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-6212/dps-2011-165.pdf>. This document provides guidance regarding the use, documenting, reporting and monitoring of restraint and seclusion with students with disabilities in school districts, including (a) when restraint or seclusion might be used, (b) considerations when selecting a training program for restraint, (c) what should be documented, (d) parent notification and reporting, and (e) monitoring use. It also contains information about s. 1003.573, F.S., Use of restraint and seclusion on students with disabilities.
4. The United States Department of Education, in collaboration with the United States Department of Justice, released **School Discipline Guidance** in the January 2014, Volume 4, Issue 1 of the **Office of Special Education Programs Monthly Update**. This package will assist states, districts and schools in developing practices and strategies to enhance school climate, and ensure those policies and practices comply with federal law. The resource documents listed below are included in the package, and are available at <http://www.ed.gov/school-discipline>:
 - **Dear Colleague** guidance letter on civil rights and discipline;
 - **Guiding Principles** document that draws from emerging research and best practices;
 - **Directory of Federal School Climate and Discipline Resources** that indexes federal technical assistance and other resources; and
 - **Compendium of School Discipline Laws and Regulations** that catalogue State laws and regulations related to school discipline.
5. According to s. 1003.57, F.S., once every three years, each school district and school shall complete a Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) assessment with a FIN facilitator and include the results of the BPIE assessment and all planned short-term and long-term improvement efforts in the school district's SP&P. BPIE is an internal assessment process designed to facilitate the analysis, implementation and improvement of inclusive educational practices at the district and school team levels.

A FIN facilitator is available to assist the school district in scheduling and completing the BPIE, and based on the results, will identify how FIN can provide support to the school district (<http://www.floridainclusionnetwork.com/>).
6. Project 10: Transition Education Network is available to assist Florida school districts in building capacity to provide secondary transition services to students with disabilities in order to improve their academic success and post-school outcomes. Project 10 serves as the primary conduit in addressing law and policy, effective practices, and research-based interventions in the area of transition services for youth with disabilities. (<http://www.project10.info/>)

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**

2013-14 ESE Monitoring and Assistance

State Support Team for Washington County School District

Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services

325 West Gaines Street
Suite 614, Turlington Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
850-245-0475
<http://www.fldoe.org/ese>

Amelia Faith Bowman
Program Specialist
Dispute Resolution and Monitoring

Patricia Howell
Program Director
Monitoring and Compliance
patricia.howell@fldoe.org

Karin Gerold
Program Specialist
Dispute Resolution and Monitoring
karin.gerold@fldoe.org

FDOE Discretionary Projects

Kathleen Christiansen
PBS Associate in Technical Assistance
Florida's PBS MTSS Project
Kchristiansen@usf.edu;

Crystal Grey-Hewitt
Consultant
FSU CARD
crystal.grey-hewitt@med.fsu.edu

Jayna Jenkins
MTSS Liaison
Florida's PS/Rtl Project
Jayna@usf.edu

Beth Hardcastle
Regional Coordinator
Florida PS/Rtl Project
hardcast@usf.edu

Shelby Robertson
Learning and Development Facilitator of
Mathematics and Science
PS/Rtl Project, USF
srobertson@usf.edu

Pamela Sudduth
Learning and Development Facilitator for
Literacy
PS/Rtl Project USF
psudduth@usf.edu

Faye Yongue
Program Coordinator
FDLRS PAEC
yonguef@paec.org

M.J. Ziemba
Regional Facilitator
FIN West
mziemba@uwf.edu

Catherine Raulerson
Regional Coordinator
SEDNET North
craulerson@usfsp.edu

Rusty Holmes
Consultant
FDLRS PAEC, SEDNET
holmesr@paec.org

Tury Lewis
Regional Transition Representative
Project 10: Transition Education Network
tllewis@mail.usf.edu

Appendix A

Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment

Appendix A: Guiding Questions – District-Level Needs Assessment

1. What are the most current data levels on each of the targeted BEESS indicators?
2. What is the gap between BEESS expected level(s) of targeted indicators and your district's current level(s) of targeted indicators?
3. Do data indicate equity issues related to the selected BEESS indicators? Are there subgroups for which the gap between expected and goal levels of performance and current levels of performance is more or less significant?
 - Gender
 - Race or ethnic group
 - Economically disadvantaged
 - Students with disabilities (by each sub-group)
 - English language learners
 - Comparison within and across above sub-groups
4. Disaggregate district-level indicator data to school levels. Which schools are contributing to total district frequency for each of the targeted BEESS indicators?
5. Disaggregate school-level indicator data by grade level. Which grades within each school are contributing to total school frequency for each of the targeted BEESS indicators?
6. Disaggregate between type of school (elementary, middle school and high school) by student outcomes.
7. What evidence-based practices are currently planned for use or implementation at the school level?
8. Are the expected evidence-based practices occurring sufficiently?
9. If expected evidence-based practices are not occurring or not occurring sufficiently, why not? (What are some potential barriers specific to targeted BEESS indicators at the school level?)
10. How are school-level evidence-based practices being supported by the district specific to BEESS indicators being targeted for improvement?
11. Are district supports for school-level practices being provided sufficiently?
12. If district supports are not occurring or not occurring sufficiently, why not? (What are some potential barriers specific to targeted BEESS indicators at the district level?)
13. What strategies, initiatives and resources have been identified in the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP) with regard to achieving annual measurable outcomes targets for students with disabilities?
14. As applicable, has the mid-year reflection based on mid-year assessment data been completed, and what, if any, adjustments have been made to the DIAP with regard to strategies to improve outcomes for students with disabilities?
15. What does the **ESE Policies and Procedures** document reflect with regard to the district's goal to improve targeted indicator performance? Did the district achieve the goal set during the prior year?
16. What is occurring to implement the strategies in the SP&P with regard to targeted indicator performance?

17. Based on all of the above answers, what priorities will be targeted to improve BEESS targeted indicators?

**Florida Department of Education
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services**

Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations

The following is a list of acronyms, abbreviations and terms used within this report.

BEESS	Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
BPIE	Best Practices for Inclusive Education
CARD	Center for Autism and Related Disabilities
CEIS	Coordinated early intervening services
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
EBD	Emotional or behavioral disability
ESE	Exceptional student education
FCAT 2.0	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0
FIN	Florida Inclusion Network
FDLRS	Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System
FDOE	Florida Department of Education
F.S.	Florida Statutes
FSU	Florida State University
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individual educational plan
LEA	Local educational agency
LRE	Least restrictive environment
MTSS	Multi-tiered system of support
OSS	Out-of-school suspension
PAEC	Panhandle Area Educational Consortium
PBS	Positive Behavior Support
PBS/MTSS	Positive Behavior Support/Multi-tiered System of Supports
PS/Rtl	Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention
Rtl	Response to intervention
SEDNET	Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities
SP&P	Exceptional Student Education Policies and Procedures
SPP	State Performance Plan
SST	State Support Team
USF	University of South Florida



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

313200V